

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Regular Meeting

October 3, 1963
10:00 A.M.

Council Chamber, City Hall

The meeting was called to order with Mayor Palmer presiding.

Roll call:

Present: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Absent: None

Present also: W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager; Doren R. Eskew, City Attorney; Reuben Rountree, Jr., Director of Public Works; Robert A. Miles, Chief of Police

MR. PRENTICE ELDER, orally and through his written application, presented his request to the Council for a building permit at 811 Red River Street, a 25' lot. The question had been raised about the provision of off-street parking. Mr. Elder stated he could provide indented parking spaces for about five cars. The Mayor noted on Red River Street, with the amount of traffic, it probably would be better to leave the parallel parking. The Planning Director said this development is not exactly what it ultimately will be, and the adjoining building may be modified and parking could be provided. The City Manager stated in the next few years, Red River would have to be widened and discussed this building in connection with the setback. After discussion, Councilman Long moved that the City Manager be instructed to grant this building permit. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

Councilman Long moved that the Minutes of the Meeting of September 19, 1963, be approved. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor brought up the following ordinance for its third reading:

ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND CHANGING THE USE
MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 39 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF
1954 AS FOLLOWS: FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "O"

OFFICE DISTRICT ON LOT 27 AND THE WEST 15 FEET OF LOT 28, STANHOPE PLACE, IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS; AND SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS.

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman LaRue moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: Councilman Long

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO A CERTAIN CONTRACT WITH J. D. SANDERS FOR THE APPROPRIATION OF MONEY PAID TO THE CITY OF AUSTIN UNDER SUCH CONTRACT; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman LaRue moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Councilman White introduced the following ordinance and moved that it be published in accordance with Article I, Section 6 of the Charter of the City of Austin, and set for public hearing for 11:00 A.M., October 17, 1963:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 1.81 ACRES OF LAND, SAME BEING OUT OF AND A PART OF THAT CERTAIN 90 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF THE JAMES P.

WALLACE SURVEY NUMBER 57, IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS;
WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO
AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY
OF AUSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA AND CHANGING THE USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 39 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF 1954 AS FOLLOWS: A. TRACT 1: FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT AND FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT AND "C" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT AND FIFTH HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "C-1" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT AND FIFTH HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT ON THE EAST 300 FEET OF LOT 3, TEX-CON ADDITION NO. 1; AND B. TRACT 2: FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "C" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ON LOT 3, LESS EAST 300 FEET, TEX-CON ADDITION NO. 1; SAID TWO TRACTS OF LAND BEING LOCATED IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; AND SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman White moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

In connection with the Capital National Bank location at 610-710 St. Johns Avenue, rear of 7200-7324 Interregional Highway and 404-608 St. Johns Avenue, Councilman Long suggested that the paving of the street in question (Duval Street) proceed; that it be paved to the end of the property line, and that the Director

of Public Works check as he does on these others where an assessment is entered into with the property owners. Councilman Long moved that the City Manager be instructed to accept the deed from the owners of the property represented by the Capital National Bank Trustee and Mr. Bill Bullard and that the City dedicate this property for street purposes and proceed with the assessment paving program. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

Pursuant to published notice thereof, the Mayor announced it was 10:30 A.M. and opened the public hearing on ordinances introduced on September 19th (annexation ordinances). No one appeared in the interest of any of these annexation ordinances. Councilman Long inquired as to a means of economizing in the publication of these ordinances by using one heading. It was explained that problems were encountered between the time of the ordinance's introduction and its passage; and if such an ordinance was included in one annexation ordinance combining several areas, and if one had to be deleted, a second publication for the original inclusive ordinance and the deleted ordinance would be necessitated. Councilman Long moved that the hearing be closed. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

Mayor Palmer brought up the following ordinance for its first reading:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN
BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXA-
TION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF
7.81 ACRES OF LAND, SAME BEING OUT OF AND A PART OF
THE GEORGE W. DAVIS SURVEY NO. 15 IN TRAVIS COUNTY,
TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT
TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY
OF AUSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE.
(Lanier Terrace, Section 4)

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman LaRue moved that the ordinance be passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

Mayor Palmer brought up the following ordinance for its first reading:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 21.35 ACRES OF LAND, SAME BEING OUT OF AND A PART OF THE WILLIAM WILKS SURVEY NO. 29, THE JOHN APPELGAIT SURVEY, AND THE PATRICK LUSK SURVEY, IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE.
(University Hills West)

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman LaRue moved that the ordinance be passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

Mayor Palmer brought up the following ordinance for its first reading:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 58.84 ACRES OF LAND, SAME BEING OUT OF AND A PART OF THE WILLIAM WILKS SURVEY NO. 29, THE PATRICK LUSK SURVEY, AND THE J.A.G. BROOKS SURVEY, IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE.
(University Hills Auburn Circle, Pearce Junior High Tract, and unplatted land)

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman LaRue moved that the ordinance be passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

Mayor Palmer brought up the following ordinance for its first reading:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 77.74 ACRES OF LAND OUT OF AND A PART OF THE JAMES P. WALLACE SURVEY NUMBER 57 IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE. (I.I.Nelson Athletic Field and Reagan High School Site)

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman LaRue moved that the ordinance be passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The City Manager submitted a letter from BROWN & ROOT, INC., Consulting Engineers for Holly Street Power Station No. 3, as follows:

"September 27, 1963
File: M-192-DVB

"Mr. W. C. Williams, Jr., City Manager
City of Austin, Texas
Post Office Box 1160
Austin 64, Texas

"STEAM GENERATOR-CONTRACT NO. 102
CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS
HOLLY STREET POWER STATION
UNIT NUMBER THREE
OUR JOB E-192

"Dear Mr. Williams:

"Your attention is invited to Item VI and Item VII for the Steam-Generator, Contract Number 102 Proposal by the A. M. Lockett & Co., Ltd. These items are options that may be exercised for omitting the forced draft fans and motor drives from this contract.

"We have reviewed the equipment proposed by the A. M. Lockett & Co., Ltd, and recommend that two 1250 horsepower motor drives be used in lieu of the two 1500 H.P. motor drives offered. This reduction in motor horsepower requirements has

also been reviewed by the A. M. Lockett & Co., Ltd. and they are in agreement with our recommendation. On the basis of this recommendation, the A. M. Lockett & Co., Ltd. has submitted prices for substitutions of 1250 H.P. motor drives. The Sturtevant Division of the Westinghouse Electric Corporation manufacturer of the equipment proposed by the A. M. Lockett & Co., Ltd. was contacted regarding prices if this equipment (two forced draft fans and two (2) 1250 H.P. motor drives) were purchased directly from them rather than through the A. M. Lockett & Co., Ltd.

"The following tabulation reflects these price changes:

	<u>A.M. Lockett Proposal Price</u>	<u>A.M. Lockett Revised Motor Price</u>	<u>Sturtevant Div. of Westinghouse Electric Corp.</u>
Item VI	\$37,360.00	\$37,360.00	-
Item VII with 1500 H.P. Motor	37,310.00	-	-
Item VII Revised 1250 H.P. Motor	-	31,300.00	-
TOTAL PRICE	<u>\$74,670.00</u>	<u>\$68,660.00</u>	<u>\$63,324.00</u>

"Based on the above tabulation it is hereby recommended that Item VI and Item VII be deleted from the scope of the equipment to be supplied by the A. M. Lockett & Company., Ltd. under the contract for the Steam-Generator Contract Number 102 for the total sum of \$74,670.00.

"It is also recommended that a Purchase Order be issued to the Sturtevant Division of Westinghouse Electric Corporation in the amount of \$63,324.00 for supplying F.O.B. plant site the two (2) Forced Draft Fans with Motor Drives.

"Should you accept the above recommendations, we suggest that the Purchase Order include the following as a description of the equipment to be supplied by the Sturtevant Division of the Westinghouse Electric Corporation:

- A. Two (2) constant-speed, motor-driven, double-inlet, double-width, forced-draft, airfoil-type, vane controlled fans having inlet control louvers and outlet control shut-off dampers.

Selection of fan wheel, shaft, and bearings shall be based on 15% overspeed.

Fans shall have air-cooled sleeve bearings, and shall include geared-type flexible couplings and guards, as manufactured by Bartlett-Hayward.

Fan components shall be dynamically balanced to insure smooth, vibration-free operation at all speeds from no-load to 115% load, and reports, furnished to the Purchaser.

Necessary ductwork from the fan discharge connection to and including the outlet damper shall be furnished under this purchase order.

"Inlet vane and outlet damper control arms, including locking quadrants, linkages, etc., for connecting to Purchaser's operators shall be provided and brought outside the fan housing by the Contractor.

The fans shall be as manufactured by the Sturtevant Division Size 4073 heavy duty DWDI open inlet, arrangement #3 with airfoil bladed wheel shaft, 1/4" housing and two 4-15/16" diameter self-aligning ball bearings mounted on independent pedestals. Housing will be split and equipped with an access door and rain.

- B. Two (2) 1250 horsepower motors designed to operate at 1200 RPM constant speed, 2300 V and shall have Class A insulation for 40°C rise above ambient temperature. The motors shall have a weather protected NEMA II type enclosure, 120 volt space heaters, resistor type detectors in stator winding, provisions for thermocouples in each bearing, and shall have sufficient torque to satisfy the fan requirements of 26,950 lb. ft.² WR².
- C. The price for this equipment to include freight, F.O.B. Plant Site, special tools, accessories, erection superintendence, instruction of plant personnel and commercial start-up including minor field adjustments.

"Yours very truly,
s/ D. V. Boyd
D. V. Boyd
Project Engineer
Brown & Root, Inc.

Approved:
s/ D. C. Kinney
D. C. Kinney, Director
of Electric Utilities
City of Austin"

The City Manager stated that under Contract No. 102, a boiler had been awarded to A. M. LOCKETT & COMPANY for the No. 3 unit. One item included in this contract was two 1500 HP Motor drives on the force draft fans. Brown and Root, Inc., after reviewing the requirements, determined only 1250 HP motors were required, and A. M. LOCKETT & COMPANY concurred that the 1250 HP would serve the purpose just as well as the 1500 HP. A. M. Lockett & Company was asked for a revised price for the two 1250 HP motors, and the City received new prices from them. A. M. Lockett & Company said they would be purchasing the equipment from STURTEVANT DIVISION OF WESTINGHOUSE. The revised price from A. M. Lockett & Company for the forced draft fans with the smaller motors resulted in a reduction of from \$74,670.00 to \$68,660. Sturtevant Company was asked for what they would furnish the fans and 1250 HP motors direct, and Sturtevant Division of Westinghouse stated they would furnish them for \$63,324.00 which is \$5,000 less than the revised Lockett price and represents a \$11,000 reduction in the boiler contract. Included in the Lockett bid were some "take-out prices." The City had reserved the option to take those items out and buy them separately; so by purchasing direct from Sturtevant, it can buy these fans and 1250 HP motors for \$63,324.00, whereas if they are left in the contract with Lockett, they would be \$68,660. The City Manager recommended that the option be exercised to delete that item from

Contract No. 102 and the purchase be made direct with Sturtevant Division of Westinghouse. After discussion, Councilman White moved to exercise the option to delete two forced draft fans and motor drives from Contract No. 102, heretofore awarded to A. M. Lockett & Company and to purchase same directly from STURTEVANT DIVISION OF WESTINGHOUSE at \$63,324.00. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

Councilman LaRue offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the City Manager be and he is hereby authorized and directed to advertise for bids on the sale of bonds of the City of Austin at 10:00 A.M., October 17, 1963, as follows:

Electric Light and Power System Revenue Bonds,
authorized at an election August 6, 1960 \$9,000,000.00

Waterworks System Revenue Bonds,
authorized at an election August 6, 1960 2,700,000.00

Sewer System Revenue Bonds,
authorized at an election August 6, 1960 2,300,000.00

Revenue Bonds Total \$14,000,000.00

Advertisement for such bids shall be in the usual and customary form and shall be published at least once in The American Statesman, Austin, Texas, and in The Bond Buyer, New York, New York, and in addition shall be given such circulation as will invite attention to the proposed sale. The right shall be reserved to the City of Austin to reject any and all bids, and no bids which include supplemental coupons will be considered. Advertisements shall direct the filing of sealed bids to be opened by the City Council at a regular meeting held for such purpose in the City Hall at the time and date hereinbefore set forth.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

COUNCILMAN LONG read a copy of a letter addressed to the Water and Light Department stating \$10.00 had been subtracted from the Water and Light bill, because on August 7th the Garbage collector, besides the regular pick-up, also collected a new lawn chair. The owners were unable to get any satisfaction, and it was claimed the chair was old and rusted although it was new. Another chair was brought out to them; but it was not theirs, so they did not accept it. Councilman Long stated this was a profound problem, and she would like to know just how it could be handled. The Mayor stated the claimant should file a claim through the proper channels and include the Bill and affidavit, etc. Councilman Long filed the letter with the City Attorney.

Mayor Palmer announced JUDGE MACE THURMAN and MR. TED WENDLANDT (representing Allen C. Bryant and Austin Enterprises, Inc.) had filed tax appeals. Councilman Long moved that the next tax appeal hearing be set on October 10, 1963, at 3:30 P.M. The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The City Manager submitted a letter from the Director of Aviation indicating that the CIVIL AIR PATROL, an Air Force sponsored activity, had acquired property on 51st Street backing up to the Airport with the thought in mind that they would build a facility and have access to the Airport. Generally, it would not be recommended to permit private owners or organizations to have access to the airport from their property; but the C.A.P. is a government sponsored activity. The C.A.P. wants permission to have an access to the runway from their buildings. The City Manager listed the conditions Colonel Murphy had recommended:

1. Approval not to be construed as setting a precedent for individuals or private organizations.
2. The C.A.P. to agree to continue fuel purchases and maintenance from one of the existing fixed base operators.
3. The C.A.P. to agree not to permit any privately owned plane to enter. (The City Manager explained even though this is a government sponsored activity, some of the members may feel they have a right to place their planes there.)
4. That the City not be expected to construct or maintain any structure for the use of the C.A.P.
5. That the C.A.P. maintain its premises in a neat and orderly fashion.

The City Manager pointed out another condition in that if a need should arise for the use of this particular land for a clear zone or for an extension of the runway that any structure that they place on their property should be replaced by them at no cost to the City. After discussion, Councilman Long moved that the City Manager be instructed to enter into this agreement with the Civil Air Patrol. The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

MRS. WALTER McBRIDE invited the Council to be present on October 11th to observe the 24th anniversary of the Principal of the L. L. Campbell School. The Mayor thanked her for the invitation and stated some of the Council would be there.

The City Manager stated the Tax Assessor had discussed a request from a gentleman wanting to reproduce from the tax records a list of property owners for the purpose of combining that with the plat book system which he would sell to people interested in such a list. The City Manager stated MR. JOHN WINDSOR indicated the Real Estate Board would like to reproduce a list of property owners and

make it available to realtors at the cost to the Board. The City Manager said, in his opinion, that would be a better approach. Councilmen LaRue and Long inquired if others would have the same privilege. The City Manager stated any citizen could come to the Tax Department and make inquiries as to ownership of property, and the Tax Department would help them. Any individual may take the items off the tax records; but if the City makes a copy for one individual, what would it do for the next? If the City could make a copy for an organization which would reproduce the list and make it available to everybody at their cost, it would be preferable. Councilman LaRue asked if the Real Estate Board would make these lists available at cost. Mr. Windsor stated they had made the plats available at cost, and he would assume these lists would be treated in the same manner. Councilman White moved that the Real Estate Board be granted permission to do this service and that such service be granted to all of the people of the City of Austin - north, south, east, and west. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The City Manager reported he had inquiry if any arrangements had been made to call the Citizens' Advisory Committee to gether in any organizational meeting. The Mayor asked that a time agreeable to the Director of the Urban Renewal be set, and some member of the Council or some member of the committee would preside until such time as a Chairman was selected by the committee. The Assistant City Manager stated he would get in touch with the Urban Renewal Director.

The City Manager stated MRS. M. L. ANDERSON had inquired about purchasing some land on Fernwood Street east of the Interregional Highway, and it was understood they would accept the deed with the provision that the remnant would be used only as a part of their lawn and not be used for any building or signs. The deed was so written, and the Andersons accepted it willingly at the time. Mrs. Anderson now reports the apartments just built had created a new problem in that some of the tenants were driving their cars on the lawn, and she wants permission to put up a sign "No Parking - Private Property." Councilman Long moved that Mrs. Anderson be allowed to have a sign of reasonable size designating the property to be "Private Property." The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Director of Public Works displayed plans proposed by the Capital National Bank for redesigning the sidewalk in front of the bank. The ordinance provides that the sidewalk must be concrete, and the Council has permitted these variances on the surface to permit these ornamental types. The Director of Public Works explained the plan. Councilman White moved that the CAPITAL NATIONAL BANK be granted permission to construct the sidewalk from the alley on 7th Street in front of the building and on to the driveway into the bank on Colorado Street, using the quarry tile as displayed and as shown on the plans. The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

Councilman Long offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, by resolution adopted August 29, 1963, the City Council of the City of Austin authorized W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager, to execute a deed for church purposes only, and providing for reversion of title, conveying to the Trustees of Covenant Presbyterian Church the certain 3 acres of land particularly described in said resolution out of the George W. Spear League, the James P. Davis Survey No. 14, and the D. J. Gilbert Survey, in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas; and,

WHEREAS, the City of Austin has been requested, on behalf of said Trustees, to modify the authority previously granted so as to authorize the City Manager to execute a deed without a provision for reversion of title in order to facilitate the use of such land for purposes of collateral security; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager, be and he is hereby authorized to execute a deed for church purposes only conveying to the Trustees of Covenant Presbyterian Church the land particularly described in that certain resolution of the City Council adopted August 29, 1963 for church purposes only with such restriction being a covenant running with the land enforceable by the City of Austin only, but providing that no other act or omission on the part of the City of Austin or any of its officials, agents, or employees shall ever constitute a release or waiver of such restriction except an express release in writing complying with all legal requirements of a conveyance of land, for such consideration, and upon such conditions, as the governing body of the City of Austin shall prescribe; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That except to the extent hereinabove provided the authority contained in that certain resolution adopted by the City Council on August 29, 1963 be and the same is hereby otherwise in all things confirmed and ratified.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

Councilman Long offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Austin has found that public necessity requires the widening and improvement of an East-West thoroughfare known as St. Elmo Road, to connect South Congress Avenue and Mt. Vernon Drive, and the widening and improvement of a North-South thoroughfare known as Vinson Drive, connecting with St. Elmo Road, to provide for the free and safe flow of traffic between such streets within the City of Austin; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council has found and determined that public necessity requires the acquisition of the hereinafter described tract of land for right of way to permit the widening and improvement of such connecting streets in the City of Austin; and,

WHEREAS, the City of Austin has negotiated with the owners of said land and has been unable to agree with such owners as to the fair cash market value thereof; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the City Manager be and he is hereby authorized and directed to file or cause to be filed against the owners and lienholders, a suit in eminent domain to acquire fee simple title for said purposes to the following described tract of land:

0.33 of one acre of land, same being out of and a part of that certain 1.00 acre tract of land out of Lot 10, Block D, of the partition of the James E. Bouldin Estate of a portion of the Isaac Decker League in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, according to a map or plat of said partition of the James E. Bouldin Estate of record in Volume U at page 78 of the Probate Minutes of Travis County, Texas, which certain 1.00 acre tract of land was conveyed to Clinton B. Coffey, et us, by Warranty Deed dated June 1948 of record in Volume 922 at page 259 of the Deed Records of Travis County, Texas; said 0.33 of one acre of land being more particularly described by metes and bounds as follows:

BEGINNING at the northwest corner of the said Clinton B. Coffey tract of land, same being the point of intersection of the present south line of St. Elmo Road with the present east line of Vinson Drive, same being also the northwest corner of the herein described tract of land;

THENCE, with the north line of the said Clinton B. Coffey tract of land, same being said present south line of St. Elmo Road, S 59° 55' E 170.00 feet to the northeast corner of the said Coffey tract of land, same being the northwest corner of that certain 1.98 acre tract of land which was conveyed to Cecil J. Naren, et ux, by warranty deed dated October 18, 1957 of record in Volume 1868 at page 357 of the Deed Records of Travis County, Texas, same being also the northeast corner of the herein described tract of land;

THENCE, with the east line of the said Coffey tract of land, same being the west line of the said Cecil J. Naren tract of land, S 29° 15' W 10.71 feet to a steel pin set at the most easterly southwest corner of the herein described tract of land, said steel pin being on the proposed curving south line of St. Elmo Road, said curve having an intersection angle of 6° 23', a radius of 1,372.69 feet and a tangent distance of 76.55 feet;

THENCE, with said proposed curving south line of St. Elmo Road along said curve to the left an arc distance of 107.01 feet, the chord of which arc bears N 62° 17' W 106.71 feet to a steel pin set at the point of compound curvature between the aforementioned curve and another curve to the left whose intersection angle is 108° 50', whose radius is 20.00 feet and whose tangent distance is 27.95 feet;

THENCE, along said curve to the left an arc distance of 37.82 feet, the long chord of which arc bears S 61° 04' W 32.52 feet to a steel pin set on the proposed curving east line of Vinson Drive, said steel pin being at the point of reverse curvature between the aforementioned curve and a curve whose intersection angle is 10° 37', whose radius is 2,029.85 feet and whose tangent distance is 188.60 feet;

THENCE, with said proposed curving east line of Vinson Drive along said curve to the right an arc distance of 376.12 feet, the long chord of which arc bears S 11° 58' W 375.58 feet to a steel pin set at the point of tangency of said curve, same being a point on the south line of the aforementioned Coffey tract of land, said steel pin being at the most westerly southwest corner of the herein described tract of land;

THENCE, with said line of the aforesaid Coffey tract of land, same being the most westerly south line of the herein described tract of land, N 59° 55' W 35.43 feet to a point in the present curving east line of Vinson Drive, said curve having a radius of 1,994.85 feet;

THENCE, along the present curving east line of Vinson Drive an arc distance of 420.12 feet, the chord of which arc bears N 12° 19' E 419.80 feet to the point of beginning. (Clinton B. Coffey, et ux)

The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

The City Manager reported on the status of the contract with reference to the widening of St. Elmo Road and in connection with the underpass for the Missouri Pacific Railroad. He stated the executed contract documents and bond had not been received, and the work order could not be issued until they were received and until the Railroad Company gave its approval. The Director of Public Works stated the documents had just been returned this morning and were sent on to the Railroad Company in St. Louis for approval.

With reference to the Windsor Road underpass, the Director of Public Works reported with a little more work to be done he hoped to advertise on October 13th for bids to be received on October 29th.

After lengthy discussion, Councilman LaRue moved that the City Manager be authorized to initiate proceedings for the purchase of the KARL SCHMIDT property near the Airport. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

The City Manager made a report on the sale of the property at Flores Street and Interregional Highway. The Mayor stated after further investigation, he thought the City should not advertise this tract for sale. After discussion, Councilman Long moved to withdraw the motion of last week instructing the City Manager to advertise the property on INTERREGIONAL HIGHWAY below Clermont Avenue for sale. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

Present but not voting: Councilman LaRue

Councilman Shanks moved that the Council decline the offer for portion of the City owned property on Interregional Highway south of Clermont, tendered by MRS. MARIAN ROSS, and to announce that the City, for the time being, has decided not to sell any of the property south of Clermont Avenue fronting on the Interregional. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

The Council recessed until 2:00 P.M.

RECESSED MEETING

2:00 P.M.

Mayor Palmer announced that hearings on Tax appeals would begin.

MR. E. M. DeGEURIN, representing the BENEVOLENT PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS, INCORPORATED, appealed the value of land only on the following properties:

BENEVOLENT PROTECTIVE - 1005 Post Oak Street, 3.11 acres of Lot 9, Block
ORDER OF ELKS, INC. B, J. E. Bouldin Estate.

	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1962	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Assessed Value by Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board
Land	\$ 13,117	\$ 47,415	\$ 35,560	Not	\$ 35,560
Improvements	116,163	116,163	87,120	Rendered	87,120
Total	\$129,280	\$163,578	\$122,680		\$122,680

- 800 Block Dawson Road, .65 of one acre of Lot 9,
Block B, J. E. Bouldin Estate.

	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1962	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Assessed Value by Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board
Land	\$ 2,596	\$ 7,079	\$ 5,310	Not	\$ 5,310
Improvements	0	0	0	Rendered	0
Total	\$ 2,596	\$ 7,079	\$ 5,310		\$ 5,310

He stated the land was not being used, and there were no immediate plans for its use. He said it was in a commercial area and was valuable property, but the Club was unable to do anything with it. He called attention to the increase from 1962 to 1963 as established by the Tax Department. He stated the Club made a contribution to the community in its benevolent activities. He described the bluff on which no credit was given as it was not determined where the property line was. MR. GLADDEN, Appraiser in the Tax Department, stated this property was valued the same as the apartment house tract. A member of the Equalization Board said the Board wanted to equalize the taxes, and this amount was in line with the values of the surrounding and adjoining property and that no credit was given for the bluff. The Mayor stated the Council would go look at the property, and he asked if the property line could be determined and bluff influences be applied.

- - - - -

MR. JAMES P. HART, represented the W. P. WEBB ESTATE on the following properties:

W. P. WEBB ESTATE - 7103 Lamar Boulevard, 332 x 334 ft. average out of
the James P. Wallace Survey.

	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1962	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Assessed Value by Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board
Land	\$ 14,527	\$ 28,657	\$ 21,490	\$ 10,900	\$ 21,490
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 14,527	\$ 28,657	\$ 21,490	\$ 10,900	\$ 21,490

- 6924 Airport Boulevard, 4.68 acres out of the James P. Wallace Survey.

Land	\$ 31,811	\$ 55,779	\$ 41,830	\$ 23,860	\$ 41,830
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 31,811	\$ 55,779	\$ 41,830	\$ 23,860	\$ 41,830

Mr. Hart protested only the increase in the value of the land at 7103 Lamar Boulevard and 6924 Airport Boulevard. He called attention to the fact that the City had drawn a line through the tract differently from that as was conveyed to Dr. Webb. The property was leased to Mr. C. B. Smith in 1959 for a 30 year period. Mr. Smith receives a total of \$195 per month for both tracts. The tract facing on Lamar had been increased 97%; the smaller tract received an increase of 75%. He asked that the values set last year be maintained. For inheritance and state tax purposes, Mr. Wendlandt was employed as an appraisor, and he set a value on these tracts at \$55,000 as against \$33,000. Mr. Ted Wendlandt discussed the condition of the land in this vicinity since 1951, and the decline in value when the Interregional was opened and Highway 183 was constructed from the Old Dallas Highway over to the Interregional. Although this land in this area is beginning to make a comeback, it does not justify the value the Department set on it. MR. C. B. SMITH discussed an island that is being used as basis for footage, and he stated the triangle belonged to the City, and the evaluation had been based on footage which takes in quite a bit of this island. MR. GLADDEN, Tax Appraisor, discussed the value set giving the history of the area and the reason the value was increased. Mayor Palmer stated the Council would go and look at the property and give an answer within a very short time.

- - - - -

At MR. WALTER WUKASCH's request, the Council reset the hearing on the tax appeal on property located at 6600 and 6700 Blocks of Burnet Road and 2400 Block of Twin Oaks Drive, for 3:30 P.M. October 10th.

- - - - -

MR. WOODROW W. PATTERSON appealed the land value of the following property:

WOODROW W. PATTERSON - 501 Lavaca Street, south 80 ft. of Lot 1 and south 80 ft. of west 18 ft. of Lot 2, Block 54, Original City.

	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1962	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Assessed Value by Tax Dept.	Value Rendered By Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board
Land	\$ 54,786	\$ 54,786	\$ 41,090	\$ 13,125	\$ 33,330
Improvements	3,777	1,000	750	1,875	0
Total	\$ 58,563	\$ 55,786	\$ 41,840	\$ 15,000	\$ 33,330

Mr. Patterson stated the values of the downtown area were going down. He gave a history of the value of this land while it was owned by SOCONY, and he purchased it for \$20,000. The Tax Department originally set an assessed value of \$41,090, double what he paid for the property. The Board adjusted the value

to \$33,330, and took the improvements off. His rental revenue was less than his taxes. He compared the tax assessment with those of shopping centers in the City stating he did not believe his property was worth any more than what land is in for in the community centers. MR. KLITGAARD, Tax Assessor, stated the City and school tax was \$785.88 now. Councilman Long inquired how his taxes compared with the property around him. Mr. Patterson stated it was in line. Councilman Long stated if he received a consideration here, the whole area would have to be lowered. Mayor Palmer stated an extensive study was made on Congress two years ago. He stated the Council would read his letter and let him know its decision (letter dated October 1, 1963, filed).

- - - - -

MR. THEO KEELEN, representing MRS. WORTH WAGNER, protested the value set on personal property, furniture and fixtures as follows:

MRS. WORTH WAGNER - Personal Property at 407 South Congress Avenue.

	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1962	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Assessed Value by Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board
Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	\$ 68,928	\$ 67,757	\$ 50,820	\$ 35,000	\$ 45,740

Mr. Keelen stated Mrs. Wagner had not received any revenue in five years from this property; that she had to modernize the bowling alley, and she placed twelve pinsetters at \$8100 each in this old building. He stated they would sell the whole thing for the note of \$47,000. The Tax Assessor stated the equipment is 52% good. Mr. Keelen stated they would appreciate some help on these taxes.

- - - - -

MR. CHARLES MORTON represented MR. J. M. ODOM on the following properties:

J. M. ODOM - 2200 Block South 7th Street, Lots 1 thru 10, Block X,
J. E. Bouldin.

	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1962	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Assessed Value by Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board
Land	\$ 2,726	\$ 4,242	\$ 3,180	\$ 2,040	\$ 3,180
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 2,726	\$ 4,242	\$ 3,180	\$ 2,040	\$ 3,180

- 2000 Block of South 7th Street, Lots 11 thru 21, Block X,
James E. Bouldin Estate.

	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1962	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Assessed Value by Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board
Land	\$ 539	\$ 881	\$ 660	\$ 400	\$ 660
Improvements	5,599	4,920	3,690	4,200	3,690
Total	\$ 6,138	\$ 5,801	\$ 4,350	\$ 4,600	\$ 4,350

- 2000 Block of South 7th Street, Lots 7 thru 13, Block W,
J. E. Bouldin.

Land	\$ 2,543	\$ 3,122	\$ 2,340	\$ 1,910	\$ 2,340
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 2,543	\$ 3,122	\$ 2,340	\$ 1,910	\$ 2,340

Mr. Morton appealed the land value only and protested the increase of over 50%. He stated the property is on the bank of the creek and part of it being in the creek bed. If the creek bed were measured, it would scale out wider than indicated on the map. The water has been up over Block X, covering 100 feet on either side of the creek. Mr. Morton stated lots farther down the creek were not increased on the same ratio. The Mayor discussed this with Mr. Gladden, Tax Appraiser. MR. GLADDEN reviewed the values of those farther down the creek and those of Mr. Odom's. Councilman Long thought the property was under assessed. The Council wanted to make a personal inspection of this property.

- - - - -

MR. ROBERT SNEED represented the following properties:

AUSTIN APARTMENTS, INC. - 1708 Manor Road, 1.62 acres out of Outlot 27,
Division C.

	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1962	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Assessed Value by Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board
Land	\$ 2,440	\$ 9,055	\$ 6,790	Not	\$ 6,790
Improvements	0	347,661	260,750	Rendered	260,750
Total	\$ 2,440	\$356,716	\$267,540		\$267,540

MANOR APARTMENTS, INC. - 4719 Harmon Avenue, Lot 10, Block V, Ridge-
top Fourth Addition.

	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1962	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Assessed Value by Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board
Land	\$ 5,322	\$ 5,322	\$ 3,990	\$ 3,990	\$ 3,990
Improvements	0	228,280	171,210	0	171,210
Total	\$ 5,322	\$233,602	\$175,200	\$ 3,990	\$175,200

Mr. Sneed's appeal was on improvements only. He filed an appeal on the Austin Apartments, Inc., only to show comparison with Manor Apartments, Inc., and stated the difference on assessed values as far as the Austin Apartments is concerned is only \$5500. The difference by using the same method of calculation of values on the Manor Apartments of assessed valuations shows a difference of \$49,816. He said they had attempted to approach the evaluation on the same basis as used by the Tax Department; namely, the approach of taking a true competitive cost price for the cost of improvement. He filed affidavits of Mr. J. R. Slover, President of both apartments, setting out the actual costs of the improvements. Mr. Sneed described the construction of the apartments, stating basically they were identical - the only difference being in the air-conditioning arrangement in the Manor House and its having \$7,246 more stone on the outside - the air-conditioning costing \$23,040 for the Manor House and \$16,734 for the Harmon House. There is a total square foot cost difference between the two buildings of 26¢. He stated there was an error in classification of the improvement because of its having more stone on the outside than the other apartment. He submitted a summary of costs of each house, showing actual construction cost, cost of plans, interim financing cost plus 10%, and showing a market value of the Manor Apartments as \$281,246.59 with assessed value of \$210,000. The value established by the Board of Equalization was \$260,750 or a difference in the Board's valuation and the valuation they figured of \$49,816. Using the same method of figuring, Austin Apartments came up with a value of \$165,493, and the Board had it at \$171,210. When they applied the same formula under the Austin Apartment Houses, they came out with the same result almost as the Tax Department and the Board of Equalization; but when they applied it to the Manor Apartment House, they came out \$50,000 apart. Mr. Sneed gave square footage figures and values on both apartments. He stated the value of square footage in the Harmon House is \$7.66, and the value established for the Manor House is \$9.30. It is his contention that the evaluation of the Manor House should be \$7.66 plus 26¢.

Mr. Sneed stated the reason he brought up the Austin Apartments was because it was the most comparable of any other apartment house in the area. The two apartments are of the same kind of construction, the same materials, and the same personnel by way of subcontracting; and he believed the two should be identical with the exception of the 26¢ per square foot differential. Mr. Sneed filed an additional exhibit to show the comparison between the two apartments. The Tax Assessor stated to base the value of all property in the City on each individual's cost would destroy the proper equalization. He stated since the appeal was made, this Department had checked with the records in the Court House, and the figures Mr. Sneed quoted are correct. He explained the different figures and stated the Department could reconcile these differences and make them the same classification since the quality of construction is the same. There are a few additional items, such as the air-conditioning and greater amount of parking area for the Manor House than for the Harmon House. He believed by placing the quality rating on these properties, it would be the same. The Mayor asked if the new figures could be applied. Mr. Klitgaard stated he would apply the same quality rating, and he believed the differences would then be taken away. The Mayor stated the Tax Department would refigure this property, and Mr. Sneed would be notified.

- - - - -

Mr. Frank Erwin represented WOODWARD, INCORPORATED, on the following:

WOODWARD, INCORPORATED - 3400 Woodleigh, Lot 27, Woodward Industrial District.

	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1962	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Assessed Value by Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board
Land	\$ 2,064	\$ 1,915	\$ 1,440	\$ 1,550	\$ 1,440
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 2,064	\$ 1,915	\$ 1,440	\$ 1,550	\$ 1,440

- 3400 Block of South Congress, Lot 25, Woodward Industrial District.

Land	\$ 10,606	\$ 11,313	\$ 8,480	\$ 7,950	\$ 8,480
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 10,606	\$ 11,313	\$ 8,480	\$ 7,950	\$ 8,480

- South Congress & Woodward Street, Lot 26, Woodward Industrial District.

Land	\$ 10,580	\$ 12,881	\$ 9,660	\$ 7,940	\$ 9,660
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 10,580	\$ 12,881	\$ 9,660	\$ 7,940	\$ 9,660

- 111 Alpine Road, Lot 21, less west 150 feet, Woodward Industrial District.

Land	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,611	\$ 2,710	\$ 2,250	\$ 2,710
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,611	\$ 2,710	\$ 2,250	\$ 2,710

- Acreage back of 3801 South Congress, Lot 20, less west 150 feet, Woodward Industrial District.

Land	\$ 5,080	\$ 6,350	\$ 4,760	\$ 3,810	\$ 4,760
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 5,080	\$ 6,350	\$ 4,760	\$ 3,810	\$ 4,760

- 3710 Woodbury Avenue, Lot 13, Woodward Industrial District.

Land	\$ 2,862	\$ 4,294	\$ 3,220	\$ 2,150	\$ 3,220
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 2,862	\$ 4,294	\$ 3,220	\$ 2,150	\$ 3,220

- 3800 Woodbury, Lot 14, Woodward Industrial District.

	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1962	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Assessed Value by Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board
Land	\$ 2,679	\$ 4,020	\$ 3,020	\$ 2,010	\$ 3,020
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 2,679	\$ 4,020	\$ 3,020	\$ 2,010	\$ 3,020

- Alpine & Woodbury Streets, Lot 11, Woodward Industrial District.

Land	\$ 3,587	\$ 4,185	\$ 3,140	\$ 2,690	\$ 3,140
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 3,587	\$ 4,185	\$ 3,140	\$ 2,690	\$ 3,140

- 3713 Woodbury Street, Lot 10, Woodward Industrial District.

Land	\$ 2,983	\$ 3,580	\$ 2,690	\$ 2,240	\$ 2,690
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 2,983	\$ 3,580	\$ 2,690	\$ 2,240	\$ 2,690

- 3805 Woodbury, Lot 9, Woodward Industrial District.

Land	\$ 3,101	\$ 3,722	\$ 2,790	\$ 2,330	\$ 2,790
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 3,101	\$ 3,722	\$ 2,790	\$ 2,330	\$ 2,790

- Ben White Boulevard and Willow Springs Road, 2.06 acres out of the Isaac Decker League.

Land	\$ 3,090	\$ 9,379	\$ 7,030	\$ 2,320	\$ 7,030
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 3,090	\$ 9,379	\$ 7,030	\$ 2,320	\$ 7,030

- Ben White Boulevard and Woodbury Drive, north 94 feet average of Lot 4, Woodward Industrial District.

Land	\$ 1,530	\$ 6,784	\$ 5,090	\$ 1,150	\$ 5,090
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 1,530	\$ 6,784	\$ 5,090	\$ 1,150	\$ 5,090

- 141 Ben White Boulevard, 44.9 x 400 feet,
Block 28, Fortview Addition.

	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1962	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Assessed Value by Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board
Land	\$ 820	\$ 1,230	\$ 920	\$ 620	\$ 920
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 820	\$ 1,230	\$ 920	\$ 620	\$ 920

- 201 Ben White Boulevard, Lot 3, Woodward
Industrial District.

Land	\$ 4,760	\$ 12,515	\$ 9,390	\$ 3,570	\$ 9,390
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 4,760	\$ 12,515	\$ 9,390	\$ 3,570	\$ 9,390

- 229 Ben White Boulevard, Lot 2, Woodward
Industrial District.

Land	\$ 3,280	\$ 9,270	\$ 6,950	\$ 2,460	\$ 6,950
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 3,280	\$ 9,270	\$ 6,950	\$ 2,460	\$ 6,950

- 311 Ben White Boulevard, Lot 1, Woodward
Industrial District.

Land	\$ 2,460	\$ 9,270	\$ 6,950	\$ 1,850	\$ 6,950
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 2,460	\$ 9,270	\$ 6,950	\$ 1,850	\$ 6,950

- 321 Ben White Boulevard, 4.16 acres out of the
Isaac Decker League.

Land	\$ 6,240	\$ 21,321	\$ 15,990	\$ 4,680	\$ 15,990
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 6,240	\$ 21,321	\$ 15,990	\$ 4,680	\$ 15,990

- Ben White Boulevard, 0.918 of an acre out of
the Isaac Decker League.

Land	\$ 1,377	\$ 4,635	\$ 3,480	\$ 1,030	\$ 3,480
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 1,377	\$ 4,635	\$ 3,480	\$ 1,030	\$ 3,480

MR. ERWIN stated within the last 90 days this block (Lots 24-31) consisting of 6.86 acres of land had been sold as acreage at \$5,000 an acre. As an example, he listed Lot 25, previously assessed at \$7,950 is now assessed at \$8,484. Converting that to acreage (1.56 acres), the assessment would be \$6,235 an acre, and the actual value would be \$8,312. The entire block sold for \$5,000 an acre, and the value of \$8,312 an acre was placed on it. Mr.

Erwin described the property as not having access to South Congress. He said Lots 24, 25, 26, 20, and 21 were comparable to Lot 25 which is being proposed to be assessed at \$8,312 actual value. Lot 27, not on South Congress, but on the corner of Woodland and Woodleigh Streets, was reduced from \$1,550 to \$1,440; even under the proposed reduction, the assessed value would be \$4,870 or an actual value of \$6,492. Those eight lots have just been sold as acreage for \$5,000 an acre.

Lots 20 and 21, for the purpose of taxation, are cut into 4 lots. The city limit line comes down parallel to South Congress 150' east of South Congress. The proposal is to raise the east parts of those lots - Lot 21 from \$2,250 to \$2,710; Lot 20 from \$3,810 to \$4,760. His protest about that was when this is considered as acreage, Lots 21 and 22 consist of 6.32 acres of land. To convert those four blocks of land, there is a value of \$30,780 for the two lots - that is the proposed assessed value. When that is divided by 6.32 acres, the assessed value is \$4,760 an acre or \$6,500 an acre market value. He stated if the block of land only a few hundred feet away, which is a comparable type of land, has just sold for \$5,000 an acre that it is not proper to have land that closely related and similarly situated to it with regard to bluffs, streets, etc., based on a market value of \$6,500. He said he was not asking for a decrease on the parts of Lots 20 and 21 that are presently in the City, although it would be proper in view of this sale, but he did not think it was proper to increase the value on those two lots that are outside the City and thereby further increase the difference between the proposed market value of those two lands and the actual market value as demonstrated by the recent sale. He asked the City to look into the matter and not make the proposed increases in Lots 21 and 20 on the portions of the lots outside the City, because those lots are already overassessed. He said they should be left at what they are now.

On the property south of Ben White Boulevard, Mr. Erwin said he did not think this property should be overassessed to force development. He did not believe undeveloped property was as valuable as the same property after it had some income producing property on it. The property south of Ben White Boulevard (6 tracts of land) constitutes 11.9 acres and should be treated as acreage. Last year, the 11.9 acres were assessed at \$14,210. The assessment is being increased to \$43,680 which is more than 300% increase. The property did not increase three times in value last year. Ben White Boulevard has its areas where it has increased the value of the land. At this point, there used to be a grade street and this property had access to a two-way street, but now it has an underpass. Instead of having access to a two-way street, they have access only to a one-way access street. This acreage has been on the tax roll at a market value of \$1,700 an acre, and the City now proposes to increase it to \$5,200 an acre. A 300% increase has not been indicated by the development of anything in this area. It is not surrounded by industrial property; it is not an isolated lot; there is a great deal of undeveloped property in the area; and the property is not on grade with Ben White Boulevard. There is trackage, but it cuts right through the area and destroys the use of some of it. He asked the Council to take a look at this particular piece of property. There is the same problem across the street on Lot 4 and in the tract of land described as 2.07 acres. The latter tract was raised from \$1,492 actual value to \$4,200 actual value, again more than 300% increase, it has frontage on Ben White Boulevard where the underpass starts.

Tract 4 was increased from \$2,200 to \$9,600, more than a 400% increase and that is where the underpass gets deeper. He said that is carrying it too far. The Mayor stated the Council would look into these figures and be in touch with him as early as it possibly could.

MR. BARROW appeared in regards to his following properties:

DAVID B. BARROW - 3317 Northland Drive, 16.87 acres out of the James P. Davis Survey.

	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1962	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Assessed Value by Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board
Land	0	0	0	Not	0
Improvements	\$ 7,278	\$ 10,287	\$ 7,720	Rendered	\$ 7,720
Total	\$ 7,278	\$ 10,287	\$ 7,720		\$ 7,720

- Dry Creek Drive, Lot 8, Block F, Northwest Hills, Section 4.

Land	\$ 42,112	\$ 42,112	\$ 31,580	\$ 20,000	\$ 31,580
Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$ 42,112	\$ 42,112	\$ 31,580	\$ 20,000	\$ 31,580

- 6301 Mountainclimb Drive, Lot 4A, Resubdivision of Lot 5, Block C, Northwest Hills, Section 5, and Lot 4, Block C, Northwest Hills, Section 4.

Land	\$ 5,874	\$ 8,600	\$ 6,450	Not	\$ 4,840
Improvements	0	0	0	Rendered	0
Total	\$ 5,874	\$ 8,600	\$ 6,450		\$ 4,840

- 6303 Mountainclimb Drive, Lot 5A, Resubdivision of Lot 5, Block C, Northwest Hills, Section 5 and Lot 4, Block C, Northwest Hills, Section 4.

Land	\$ 4,871	\$ 7,091	\$ 5,320	Not	\$ 5,320
Improvements	0	31,633	23,720	Rendered	23,720
Total	\$ 4,871	\$ 38,724	\$ 29,040		\$ 29,040

- 3917 Sierra Drive, Lot 14, Block B, Northwest Hills, Section 5.

	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1962	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Assessed Value by Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board
Land	\$ 5,015	\$ 7,375	\$ 5,530	Not	\$ 5,530
Improvements	0	0	0	Rendered	0
Total	\$ 5,015	\$ 7,375	\$ 5,530		\$ 5,530

- 3903 Sierra Drive, Lot 7, Block B, Northwest Hills, Section 5.

	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1962	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Assessed Value by Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board
Land	\$ 5,094	\$ 7,491	\$ 5,620	Not	\$ 5,620
Improvements	0	0	0	Rendered	0
Total	\$ 5,094	\$ 7,491	\$ 5,620		\$ 5,620

- 6308 Mountainclimb Drive, Lot 5, Block B, Northwest Hills, Section 5.

Land	\$ 4,894	\$ 7,196	\$ 5,400	Not	\$ 5,400
Improvements	0	0	0	Rendered	0
Total	\$ 4,894	\$ 7,196	\$ 5,400		\$ 5,400

- 6306 Mountainclimb Drive, Lot 4, Block B, Northwest Hills, Section 5.

Land	\$ 4,877	\$ 6,455	\$ 4,840	Not	\$ 4,840
Improvements	0	0	0	Rendered	0
Total	\$ 4,877	\$ 6,455	\$ 4,840		\$ 4,840

- 6304 Mountainclimb Drive, Lot 3, Block B, Northwest Hills, Section 5.

Land	\$ 4,162	\$ 6,483	\$ 4,860	Not	\$ 4,860
Improvements	0	0	0	Rendered	0
Total	\$ 4,162	\$ 6,483	\$ 4,860		\$ 4,860

- 6600 Mesa Drive, Lot 2, Block I, Northwest Hills, Section 5.

Land	\$ 5,610	\$ 8,251	\$ 6,190	Not	No Appeal
Improvements	0	0	0	Rendered	
Total	\$ 5,610	\$ 8,251	\$ 6,190		

- 4107 Northhills Drive, Lot 9, Block R, Northwest Hills, Section 6.

Land	New Subd.	\$ 4,774	\$ 3,580	Not	\$ 2,690
Improvements	for 1963.	0	0	Rendered	0
Total		\$ 4,774	\$ 3,580		\$ 2,690

- 6902 Mesa Drive, Lot 2, Block R, Northwest Hills, Section 6.

Land	New Subd.	\$ 5,387	\$ 4,040	Not	\$ 3,030
Improvements	for 1963.	0	0	Rendered	0
Total		\$ 5,387	\$ 4,040		\$ 3,030

- 6900 Mesa Drive, Lot 1, Block R, Northwest Hills, Section 6.

	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1962	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Assessed Value by Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board
Land	New Subd.	\$ 7,923	\$ 5,940	Not	\$ 4,460
Improvements	for 1963.	0	0	Rendered	0
Total		\$ 7,923	\$ 5,940		\$ 4,460

- 4102 Farhills Drive, Lot 5, Block R, Northwest Hills, Section 6.

Land	New Subd.	\$ 5,585	\$ 4,190	Not	\$ 3,140
Improvements	for 1963.	0	0	Rendered	0
Total		\$ 5,585	\$ 4,190		\$ 3,140

- 4104 Farhills Drive, Lot 6, Block R, Northwest Hills, Section 6.

Land	New Subd.	\$ 6,284	\$ 4,710	Not	\$ 3,530
Improvements	for 1963.	0	0	Rendered	0
Total		\$ 6,284	\$ 4,710		\$ 3,530

- 4106 Farhills Drive, Lot 8, Block R, Northwest Hills, Section 6.

Land	New Subd.	\$ 5,870	\$ 4,400	Not	\$ 3,300
Improvements	for 1963.	0	0	Rendered	0
Total		\$ 5,870	\$ 4,400		\$ 3,300

- 4108 Farhills Drive, Lot 10, Block R, Northwest Hills, Section 6.

Land	New Subd.	\$ 5,835	\$ 4,380	Not	\$ 3,280
Improvements	for 1963.	0	0	Rendered	0
Total		\$ 5,835	\$ 4,380		\$ 3,280

- Spicewood Springs Road, 248.46 acres out of the James Coleman Survey.

Land	\$ 99,384	\$ 99,384	\$ 74,540	\$ 74,540	\$ 74,540
Improvements	2,534	2,411	1,810	1,900	1,810
Total	\$101,918	\$101,795	\$ 76,350	\$ 76,440	\$ 76,350

- St. Edwards Farm, 107.614 acres out of the Santiago Del Valle Grant or Tract 4.

Land	\$161,421	\$215,228	\$161,420	Not	\$161,420
Improvements	0	0	0	Rendered	0
Total	\$161,421	\$215,228	\$161,420		\$161,420

MR. BARROW stated the 107.64 acres (St. Edwards Farm) was purchased for \$148,000; and after it was purchased, it was found that 30 acres of this land had been used for a sanitary fill and now has little or no value. No buildings could be placed there. He stated the purchase prices were below the assessed value.

Mr. Barrow appealed the value of the improvements on Spicewood Springs Road (248.46 acres) stating there were two rock houses which do not have any value. The Tax Assessor stated he had made another inspection, and he agreed that the houses were of no value. The Mayor asked that the \$1,810 value on the houses be taken off.

Mr. Barrow appealed the value of the improvements at 3317 Northland Drive which is property leased from KVET and from which he may have to move on 30 days' notice. He said there were some inaccuracies in the Tax Department figures as the house was not on a slab, there were no tile floors, and there were some other mistakes. He said he would not be using the house but two or three years more; and when it is removed, it would have little or no value. The Council wanted to look at this property. This improvement was his office.

On Lot 8, Block F, Dry Creek Drive, Northwest Hills, Section 4, Mr. Barrow stated this was a six acre tract at \$5,000 an acre. This is an area to be commercialized when it is ready for commercial development. It is valued the same as property on Airport Boulevard and the Dallas Highway.

Mr. Barrow discussed Lot 4A, Northwest Hills, Section 5, which had been resubdivided and 10' taken from the lot, but the assessment was 50% more. After discussion, it was pointed out the Equalization Board had reduced the assessed value to \$4,840.

Mr. Barrow stated he had sold Lots 3B (6304 Mountainclimb Drive), Northwest Hills, Section 5, Lots 6B, 8B, and 9B for \$5,000 in the last 7 or 8 months, and the other lots in Section 5 were comparable (3B, 4B, 5B, 7B, and 15B). He stated he believed the policy of the City Tax Department is wrong and is harmful to the subdivider and to the City to take subdivided land and put on it a tax value which is right up to what the sale price of the lot is. He stated property in Austin was not valued for taxes at the full market value nor 75% of the market value. He said there was being placed an undue burden upon the undeveloping by putting the value of these vacant lots unsold at 75% of the market value when property generally is not taxed at 75% of the market value. The Mayor asked what his conception of market value would be if he were selling lots, one sale right after the other in a fast moving deal and all lots selling around \$7,000 or \$7,500? Mr. Barrow, after discussion, stated the City ought to graduate the assessed value of the lots on some kind of reasonable basis--any kind of a value less than 75% of the full value on vacant lots. He suggested that the 75% be placed on the lot when it is put to use. The Mayor inquired about the State law, and the City Attorney explained. Referring to the lots under appeal, the Mayor asked Mr. Barrow what percentage did he think they were over valued. He stated he had sold 3 of the lots for \$5,000. Councilman LaRue stated they had full value listed at approximately \$7,000 and \$6,000. Mayor Palmer asked him if he thought they were that much off.

Mr. Barrow stated all of the lots he had in Northwest Hills, Section 6, were in the Water District; and he could not sell them at all. The Mayor stated this would be remedied.

MR. FRANK DENIUS made a report to the Council on the gas matter stating notification from United Gas Company that it would try to arbitrate the price of gas paid by Southern Union at the City gate between now and April 1, 1967, had been received. MR. R. W. MALONE of Dallas had been appointed as their arbitrator. Southern Union will appoint its arbitrator, and the two will then select a third. If they cannot agree, the Federal District Judge will appoint the third arbitrator to decide upon the price to be paid by Southern Union for gas at the City gate which price is now 17¢.

MR. DENIUS discussed two decisions in regard to Federal Power Commission jurisdiction which tend to enlarge the jurisdiction of the F.P.C. He reported United Gas Company had filed with the F.P.C. an application for it to review the operation of Coastal States and determine whether or not it is a natural gas company under the Natural Gas Act of 1938; if so, whether or not the F.P.C. would have jurisdiction over the sale of gas to the City Power Plant, to the Bastrop L.C.R.A. Plant, and to Southern Union. That proceeding was filed September 20th. The City Attorney discussed this matter before the Council.

The City Manager stated the City owns property with a concrete block house the north side of Ben White Boulevard on Fort View Road. The tract is large enough to develop as a separate tract, and inquiry had been made about the sale of the property. He said there should be a strip retained for widening the street. The Council, on Councilman LaRue's motion, voted that the City Manager be authorized to offer this property for sale under the normal procedures and that the date be at 10:00 A.M., November 7th, and that no bid under \$30,000 be accepted. Councilman Long stated she would like to see an auction on this.

The City Manager discussed land that lies within the scope of the Glen Oaks Urban Renewal project stating the Council had authorized the purchases of property in the flood plains. Money had been available out of the Street and Drainage Bond funds. The LOTT family who own property which is immediately east of Rosewood Park, between the Park and the Railroad tract and which is in the Urban Renewal Project Area, want to sell it to the City. The City Attorney showed the location on the map. There are 20 houses and about 23 lots. He stated there would never be a better opportunity to enlarge Rosewood Park than by getting this property at this time. The property is on Singleton Avenue and adjoins Rosewood Park on the East and also adjoins Short Cedar Street. The Mayor asked if this purchase would give the credit to the City under the Urban Renewal. The City Attorney discussed the appraisals made, and the LOTT family had accepted the City appraisal. He discussed also the financing of this purchase in that a cash payment could be made and the rest budgeted in the future. The Mayor stated that the City Manager would check with the Urban Renewal regarding eligibility for credit, would find the amount of down payment that would be acceptable, and see about getting another appraisal. The City Attorney stated he would inform the LOTTS that the City is interested, but not sure about the price; and in the meantime, he would check on another appraisal.

The City Manager reported that application for a building permit for a dormitory for 700 students was made to the Building Official. The City Attorney

stated under the ordinance it should not be permitted, but the staff had been reviewing the proposed new ordinance to see if it would fit under its provisions. It was found the existing ordinance was more lenient with the exception of the off-street parking requirements. The apartment classification and the proposed ordinance were discussed, with reference to off-street parking requirements; provisions for open space; heavier concentration in the University area; density of 700 people to one acre would require enlarging the utility mains; and providing wider streets. The Building Official reported a request for two ten-story apartments on Rio Grande, but the developer had not yet provided for off-street parking. The Mayor suggested that the Planning Director and Building Inspector get together and work out something on projects as these, and Councilman Long suggested that they explain it also to the Planning Commission as to what they have in mind.

The City Manager made a report on the purchase of Travis-Williamson County Water Control, and Improvement District No. 1, stating everything was in order to close the transaction. The Board had met with the Tax Assessor; and after reviewing their audit and liabilities which were known, they came up with a tax rate of \$2.75 which would have to be levied. The City Manager stated some additional pipe had been located which would result in a small reduction, and there are some additional items that the Board thinks should be included. He stated these details would all be worked out. Some of the members of the Board indicated they thought they should be paid Directors' fees which would be as a liability or obligation; and if that were done the tax rate would be increased. After discussion, the City Attorney asked if it were the Council's view that these directors' fees not be a liability to be taken into consideration, and the Mayor answered that was correct.

The City Manager read the report on the matter of the new car-wash operation as received from the Superintendent of the Sewage Disposal Plant. It was his recommendation that such car-wash operations disposal into sanitary sewers not be permitted.

The City Manager submitted a communication from the Probate Office at the Court House asking for parking spaces. Parking spaces have been provided for the Sheriff, Welfare Department, Justices of the Peace, County Clerk, and others. If this is continued, there will be no spaces for the general public who have business at the Court House. The Traffic Engineer stated there are only four spaces left, and he suggested the best thing would be to take all of the meters out on Guadalupe Street from 10th to 11th and on 10th Street from Guadalupe Street to San Antonio and call on the County Judge to designate how those spaces would be reserved, and the Traffic Department mark them accordingly. The City Attorney stated there was no provision for this reserved parking practice at all in the Traffic Laws. Councilman Long suggested that the Council adopt a Resolution urging the County Commissioners to provide off-street parking for the general public. Councilman LaRue stated this reserved parking should not be turned over to the County Judge, and the City should control it. The City Manager said the City would set aside the space to be apportioned.

There being no further business, Councilman Long moved that the Council

adjourn. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

The Council adjourned at 6:50 P.M., subject to the call of the Mayor.

APPROVED

Lucretia E. Palmer
Mayor

ATTEST:

Elva Harlow
City Clerk